

The Drift From Domesticity

by G.K. Chesterton

G.K. Chesterton (1874-1936) is best known as a writer of fiction and poetry. However, his essays on political, economic and social themes are being re-discovered by a new generation as a source of profound common sense. Chesterton is regarded by many as the "revolutionary for tradition" who employed unorthodox means for orthodox ends. Nevertheless, while an ardent foe of liberalism, Chesterton was anything but the reactionary. He held more disdain for the hypocritical "conservative"—the man who hides behind a facade of respectability to justify his own immoral privileges—than the hard-core leftist. The latter was at least honest enough to say what he stood for even if it was completely wrong. For Chesterton, like us, always preferred an open fight. Finally, Chesterton stands out as a "social prophet" who foresaw so many of the evils of our days. He was "politically incorrect" long before the liberals had defined as "political correctness" was. The materialist establishment had hammered away at culture, religion and community but it would not be satisfied until it had stamped out the one remaining bastion of sanity and morality—the Family. In the following essay Chesterton clearly reveals himself the master of paradox with his agile wit and ability to turn liberal arguments on their head.



In the matter of reforming things, as distinct from deforming them, there is one plain and simple principle; a principle which will probably be called a paradox. There exists in such a case a certain institution or law; let us say, for the sake of simplicity, a fence or gate erected across a road. The more modern type of reformer goes gaily up to it and says, "I don't see the point of this; let us clear it away." To which the more intelligent type of reformer will do well to answer: "If you don't see the use of it, I certainly won't let you clear it away. Go away and think. Then, when you can come back and tell me that you *do* see the use of it, I may allow you to destroy it."

This paradox rests on the most elementary common sense. The gate or fence did not grow there. It was not set up by somnambulists who built it in their sleep. It is highly improbable that it was put there by escaped lunatics who were for some reason loose in the street. Some person had some reason for thinking it would be a good thing for somebody. And until we know what the reason was, we really cannot judge whether the reason was reasonable. It is extremely probable that we have overlooked some whole aspect of the question, if something set up by human beings like ourselves

seems to be entirely meaningless and mysterious. There are reformers who get over this difficulty by assuming that all their fathers were fools; but if that be so, we can only say that folly appears to be a hereditary disease. But the truth is that nobody has any business to destroy a social institution until he has really seen it as an historical institution. If he knows how it arose, and what purpose it was supposed to serve, he may really be able to say that they were bad purposes, or that they have since become bad purposes, or that they are purposes which are no longer served. But if he simply stares at the thing as a senseless monstrosity that has somehow sprung up in his path, it is he and not the traditionalist who is suffering from an illusion. We might even say that he is seeing things in a nightmare. This principle applies to a thousand things, to trifles as well as true institutions, to conventions as well as to conviction. It was exactly the sort of person, like Joan of Arc, who did know why women wore skirts, who was most justified in not wearing one; it was exactly the sort of person, like St. Francis, who did sympathise with the feast and the fireside, who was most entitled to become a beggar on the open road. And when, in the general emancipation of modern society, the Duchess says she does not see why she shouldn't play leapfrog, or the Dean declares that he sees no valid canonical reason why he should not stand on his head, we may say to these persons with patient benevolence: "Defer, therefore, the operation you contemplate until you have realised by ripe reflection what principle or prejudice you are violating. Then play leapfrog and stand on your head and the Lord be with you."

Among the traditions that are being thus attacked, not intelligently but most unintelligently, is the fundamental human creation called the Household or the Home. That is a typical thing which men attack, not because they can see through it, but because they cannot see it all. They beat at it blindly, in a fashion entirely haphazard and opportunist; and many of them would pull it down without even pausing to ask why it was ever put up. It is true that only a few of them would have avowed this object in so many words. That only proves how very blind and blundering they are. But they have fallen into a habit of mere drift and gradual detachment from family life; something that is often merely accidental and devoid of any definite theory at all. But though it is accidental it is none the less anarchical. And it is all the more anarchical for not being anarchist. It seems to be largely founded on individual irritation; an irritation which varies with the individual. We are merely told that in this or that case a particular temperament was tormented by a particular environment; but nobody even explained how the evil arose, let alone whether the evil is really escaped. We are told that in this or that family Grandmamma

talked a great deal of nonsense, which God knows is true; or that it is very difficult to have intimate intellectual relations with Uncle Gregory without telling him he is a fool, which is indeed the case. But nobody seriously considers the remedy, or even the malady; or whether the existing individualistic dissolution is a remedy at all. Much of this business began with the influence of Ibsen, a very powerful dramatist and an exceedingly feeble philosopher. I suppose that Nora of *The Doll's House* was intended to be an inconsequent person; but certainly her most inconsequent action was her last. She complained that she was not yet fit to look after children, and then proceeded to get as far as possible from the children, that she might study them more closely.

There is one simple test and type of this neglect of scientific thinking and the sense of a social rule; the neglect which has now left us with nothing but a welter of exceptions. I have read hundreds and thousands of times, in all the novels and newspapers of our epoch, certain phrases about the just right of the young to liberty, about the unjust claim of the elders to control, about the conception that all souls must be free or all citizens equal, about the absurdity of authority or the degradation of obedience. I am not arguing those matters directly at the moment. But what strikes me as astounding, in a logical sense, is that not one of these myriad novelists and newspaper-men ever seems to think of asking the next and most obvious question. It never seems to occur to them to enquire what becomes of the opposite obligation. If the child is free from the first to disregard the parent, why is not the parent free from the first to disregard the child? If Mr. Jones, Senior, and Mr. Jones, Junior, are only two free and equal citizens, why should one citizen sponge on another citizen for the first fifteen years of his life? Why should the elder Mr. Jones be expected to feed, clothe and shelter out of his own pocket another person who is entirely free of any obligation to him? If the bright young thing cannot be asked to tolerate her grandmother, who has become something of a bore, why should the grandmother or the mother have tolerated the bright young thing at a period of her life when she was by no means bright? Why did they laboriously look after her at a time when her contributions to the conversation were seldom epigrammatic and not often intelligible? Why should Jones Senior stand drinks and free meals to anybody so unpleasant as Jones Junior, especially in the immature phases of his existence? Why should he not throw the baby out of the window; or at any rate, kick the boy out of doors? It is obvious that we are dealing with a real relation, which may be equality, but is certainly not similarity.

Some social reformers try to evade this difficulty, I know, by some vague notions about the State or an abstraction called Education eliminating the parental function. But this, like many notions of solid scientific persons, is a wild illusion of the nature of mere moonshine. It is based on that strange new superstition, the idea of infinite resources of organisation. It is as if officials grew like grass or bred like rabbits. There is supposed to be an endless supply of salaried persons, and of salaries for them; and they are to undertake all that human beings naturally do for themselves; including the care of children. But men cannot live by taking in each other's baby-linen. They cannot provide a tutor for each citizen; who is to tutor the tutors? Men cannot be educated by machinery; and though there might be a Robot bricklayer or scavenger, there will never be a Robot schoolmaster or governess. The actual effect of this theory is that one harassed person has to look after a hundred children, instead of one normal person looking after a normal number of them. Normally that normal person is urged by a natural force, which costs nothing and does not require a salary; the force of natural affection for his young, which exists even among the animals. If you cut off that

natural force, and substitute a paid bureaucracy, you are like a fool who should pay men to turn the wheel of his mill, because he refused to use wind or water which he could get for nothing. You are like a lunatic who should carefully water his garden with a watering-can, while holding up an umbrella to keep off the rain.

It is now necessary to recite these truisms; for only by doing so can we begin to get a glimpse of that *reason* for the existence of the family, which I began this essay by demanding. They were all familiar to our fathers, who believed in the links of kinship and also in the links of logic. To-day our logic consists mostly of missing links; and our family largely about absent members. But, anyhow, this is the right end at which to begin any such enquiry; and *not* at the tail-end or the fag-end of some private muddle, by which Dick has become discontented or Susan has gone off on her own. If Dick or Susan wish to destroy the family because they do not see the use of it, they had much better preserve it. They have no business even to think of destroying it until they have seen the use of it.

But it has other uses, besides the obvious fact that it means a necessary social work being done for love when it cannot be done for money; and (one might almost dare to hint) presumably to be repaid with love since it is never repaid in money. On that simple side of the matter the general situation is easy to record. The existing and general system of society, subject in our own age and industrial culture to very gross abuses and painful problems, is nevertheless a normal one. It is the idea that the commonwealth is made up of a number of small kingdoms, of which a man and woman become the king and queen and in which they exercise a reasonable authority, subject to the common sense of the commonwealth, until those under their care grow up to found similar kingdoms and exercise similar authority. This is the social structure of mankind, far older than all its records and more universal than any of its religions; and all attempts to alter it are mere talk and tomfoolery.

But the other advantage of the small group is now not so much neglected as simply not realised. Here again we have some extraordinary delusions spread all over the literature and journalism of our time. Those delusions now exist in such a degree that we may say, for all practical purposes, that when a thing has been stated about a thousand times as obviously true, it is almost certain to be obviously false. One such statement may be specially noted here. There is undoubtedly something to be said against domesticity and in favour of the general drift towards life in hotels, clubs, colleges, communal settlements and the rest; or for a social life organised on the plan of the great commercial systems of our time. But the truly extraordinary suggestion is often made that this escape from the home is an escape into greater freedom. The change is actually offered as favourable to liberty.

To anybody who can think, of course, it is exactly the opposite. The domestic division of human society is not perfect, being human. It does not achieve complete liberty; a thing somewhat difficult to do or even to define. But it is a mere matter of arithmetic that it puts a larger number of people in supreme control of something, and able to shape it to their personal liking, than do the vast organisations that rule society outside; whether those systems are legal or commercial or even merely social. Even if we were only considering the parents, it is plain that there are more parents than there are policemen or politicians or heads of big business or proprietors of hotels. As I shall suggest in a moment, the argument actually applies indirectly to the children as well as directly to the parents. But the main point is that the world *outside* the home is now under a rigid discipline and routine and it is only inside the home that

there is really a place for individuality and liberty. Anyone stepping out of the front-door is obliged to step into a procession, all going the same way and to a great extent even obliged to wear the same uniform. Business, especially big business, is now organised like an army. It is, as some would say, a sort of mild militarism without bloodshed; as I should say, a militarism without the military virtues. But anyhow, it is obvious that a hundred clerks in a bank or hundred waitresses in a teashop are more regimented and under rule than the same individuals when each has gone back to his or her own dwelling or lodging, hung with his or her favourite pictures or fragrant with his or her favourite cheap cigarettes. But this, which is so obvious in the commercial case, is no less true even in the social case. In practise, the pursuit of pleasure is merely the pursuit of fashion. The pursuit of fashion is merely the pursuit of convention; only that it happens to be a new convention. The jazz dances, the joy rides, the big pleasure parties and hotel entertainments, do not make any more provision for a *really* independent taste than did any of the fashions of the past. If a wealthy young lady wants to do what all the other wealthy young ladies are doing, she will find it great fun, simply because youth is fun and society is fun. She will enjoy being modern exactly as the Victorian grandmother enjoyed being Victorian. And quite right too; but it is the enjoyment of convention, not the enjoyment of liberty. It is perfectly healthy for all young people of all historic periods to herd together, to a reasonable extent, and enthusiastically copy each other. But in that there is nothing particularly fresh and certainly nothing particularly free. The girl who likes shaving her head and powdering her nose and wearing short skirts will find the world organised for her and will march happily with the procession. But a girl who happened to like having her hair down to her heels or loading herself with barbaric gauds and trailing garments or (most awful of all) leaving her nose in its natural state—she will still be well advised to do these things on her own premises. If the Duchess does want to play leapfrog, she must not start suddenly leaping in the manner of a frog across the ballroom of the Babylon Hotel, when it is crowded with the fifty best couples professionally practising the very latest dance, for the instruction of society. The Duchess will find it easier to practise leapfrog to the admiration of her intimate friends in the old oak-panelled hall of Fitzdragon Castle. If the Dean must stand on his head, he will do it with more ease and grace in the calm atmosphere of the Deanery than by attempting to interrupt the programme of some social entertainment already organised for philanthropic purposes.

If there is this impersonal routine in commercial and even in social things, it goes without saying that it exists and always must exist in political and legal things. For instance, the punishments of the State must be sweeping generalisations. It is only the punishments of the home that can possibly be adapted to the individual case; because it is only there that the judge can know anything of the individual. If Tommy takes a silver thimble out of a work-basket, his mother may act very

differently according as she knows that he did it for fun or for spite or to sell to somebody, or to get somebody into trouble. But if Tompkins takes a silver thimble out of a shop, the law not only can but must punish him according to the rule made for all shoplifters or stealers of silver. It is only the domestic discipline that can show any sympathy or especially any humour. I do not say that the family always does do this; but I say that the State ought never to attempt it. So that even if we consider the parents alone as independent princes, and the children merely as subjects, the relative freedom of the family can and often does work to the advantage of those subjects. But so long as the children are children, they will always be the subjects of somebody. The question is whether they are to be distributed naturally under their natural princes, as the old phrase went, who normally feel for them what nobody else will feel, a natural affection. It seems to me clear that this normal distribution gives the largest amount of liberty to the largest number of people.

My complaint of the anti-domestic drift is that it is unintelligent. People do not know what they are doing; because they do not know what they are undoing. There are a multitude of modern manifestations, from the largest to the smallest, ranging from a divorce to a picnic party. But each is a separate escape or evasion; and especially an evasion of the point at issue. People ought to decide in a philosophic fashion whether they desire the traditional social order or not; or if there is any particular alternative to be desired. As it is they treat the public question merely as a mess or medley of private questions. Even in being anti-domestic they are much too domestic in their test of domesticity. Each family considers only its own case and the result is merely narrow and negative. Each case is an exception to the rule that does not exist. The family, especially in the modern state, stands in need of considerable correction and reconstruction; most things do in the modern state. But the family mansion should be preserved or destroyed or rebuilt; it should not be allowed to fall to pieces brick by brick because nobody has any historic sense of the object of bricklaying. For instance, the architects of the restoration should rebuild the house with wide and easily opened doors, for the practice of the ancient virtue of hospitality. In other words, private property should be distributed with sufficiently decent equality to allow of a margin for festive intercourse. But the hospitality of a house will always be different from the hospitality of a hotel. And it will be different in being more individual, more independent, more interesting than the hospitality of a hotel. It is perfectly right that the young Browns and the young Robinsons should meet and mix and dance and make asses of themselves, according to the design of their Creator. But there will always be some difference between the Browns entertaining the Robinsons and the Robinsons entertaining the Browns. And it will be a difference to the advantage of variety, of personality, of the potentialities of the mind of man; or, in other words, of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

With acknowledgement to **A Third Positionist Reader**, a newly-published anthology compiled for the spiritual enhancement of distributists and patriots. Available for £3 from BCM-ITP, London WC1N 3XX.

READ SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy £1 from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

FREEDOM VIDEOS. A wide range of revisionist VHS videos available in our latest sales list. S.a.e. to Freedom Videos, BM-TRUTH, London WC1N 3XX

THE CHARLATANS OF CONGRESS

THE late A. R. Orage, whom many consider to have been the greatest editor of his time, and one of whose contributors the present writer had the honour of being for many years, used to say that if you wanted the *real* news you could find it only in small, out-of-the-way periodicals written by and for an élite. That applies acutely to *Candour*, and, as there may be some aspects of what the Germans might call *der Fall Indiens* that have escaped even its readers, perhaps it may not be considered amiss if a Sicilian-Parsi with a double dose of the scepticism and realism for which both sides of his ancestry are notorious draws attention to them.

A vast area, or rather congeries of areas—such as India—whose very name is the *suggestio falsi* of that unity that has never existed and certainly never will exist unless imposed from the outside, is the predestined happy-hunting ground for the sentimentalitarian and the democracy illusion-monger *outside* and the political careerist and charlatan *inside*. The myth of that “unity”, sedulously propagated by Congressite propagandists, with their blandly impudent disregard of historical facts, never, it seems, urged anyone to question why street names had to be put up in *three different sets of characters* for the information in *one and the same city* of three mutually incomprehensible communities. The lie received its final and shattering exposure at the hands of Jinnah and his Pakistanis, the products of a culture so remote from that of the Hindus that the widest national difference in Europe is not comparable with it.

MASSACRE UNLIMITED

The first result of “liberation” from what that colossal old fraud and humbug Ghandi called “the Satanic” government of the Raj was that massacres on an astronomical scale took place, with, on the part of Nehru’s “peace-loving” Hindus, such remarkable examples of their mildness as the disembowelling of expectant Pakistani mothers by the thousands, and the additional refinement of the wedging of wells brimful with the corpses of these unhappy souls with those of their unborn children.

Consider now the fantastic and hypocritical pretensions of Nehru and Co., their ludicrous masquerading in the “democratic” rags and tatters of that discarded and discredited European “liberalism” which has nothing of any truly liberal spirit about it, and which the great Papal Encyclicals of the last 75 years have exposed and analysed with a deadly and incomparable precision. Readers will, of course, remember the solemn undertakings given to the Princely States by Nehru to the effect that those who did not want to join his precious “Indian Union” could contract out. The largest and most important, Hyderabad, which was conspicuous for the excellence of its administration and its very low taxation under a highly intelligent and accomplished ruler, was promptly bombed into submission. The reason was pretty plain. The contrast between the excellent state of Hyderabad and the unholy mess of incompetence, rascality, nepotism and corruption in “free” India could not be tolerated. And the numbers of Indian trade unionists incarcerated without charge or trial for indefinite periods since the Nehru brand of “freedom” descended upon India is authoritatively stated greatly to exceed the total number of political offenders in the whole previous 150 years of British rule.

EPIC IMPUDENCE

Consider next the actions of the noisy denouncer of aggression and colonialism in the matter of Goa, and the utter impudence of his pretensions thereunto. Goa was

founded by the Portuguese 500 years ago; it is their creation, a little bit of Latin and Catholic culture, and it is venerated throughout the Catholic world as the burial place of St. Francis Xavier. No such thing as what is now called India existed when Goa was founded, nor for centuries later. The supreme ruling power at that time and for long thereafter was that of the Moghul Emperors, whose spiritual heirs are they of Pakistan, from whom this impudent claim does *not* come. There seems very little reason for doubt that the motives in the case of Goa are much the same as in the case of Hyderabad.

For epic impudence, however, Nehru’s assumption of championship of the coloured peoples against the “colour bar” far surpasses any of his other experiments in humbug. Nehru and his like, high-caste Brahmins, are what they are by virtue of the cruellest and most ruthless colour bar the world has ever known, the caste-system, which was imposed upon the darker skinned inhabitants of India by the Aryan invaders thereof, whose descendants are to-day the caste Brahmins. At the bottom they placed the unfortunate “untouchables”, where they still are after a couple of millenia in spite of all the window-dressing of legal abolition of “untouchability”, which, of course, means nothing whatever. Dr. Ambedkar’s deadly exposure of the pretensions of Gandhi and Congress in their pose as champions of the untouchables in (among other books) *What Gandhi and Congress Have Done to the Untouchables* is not nearly as well known as it should be here. The cold cruelty and callous inhumanity with which the *harijans* have been, and are still, treated would be hard to surpass in the history of any people anywhere.

It is, above all, in matters of finance, banking and money that Nehru and his associates show not only that they have learnt nothing but possibly forgotten everything that during the past 40 or more years has exposed the corrupt and malignant imbecility of the accepted system for all but the deliberately and interestedly blind to fail to see. Is not this possibly the crux of the matter; for would our platitude-mongering Pandit be the *persona gratissima* he so plainly is in high financial circles in America did he not toe the orthodox financial line?

JAPAN’S HETERODOXY

Blindness, induced, cultivated or natural, to financial and monetary realities is not by any means universal in India, certainly not among the Parsis—who are the most mentally alert and aware, but who are not, of course, in any way “Indian”, and greatly resent being so described. One of my family connections in Bombay is the managing director of a leading bank who, with complete frankness, described the banking and financial system for what all of us who know the work of the great monetary reformers, from Major Douglas and Professor Soddy to Father Denis Fahey know it to be, as “the biggest fraud and swindle ever put over a silly world and my only excuse for being associated with it is that I have a wife and family to keep” (his actual words!). Another relative was partially ruined when the hundred-odd mills of the Currimbhoy Trust packed up, knocked out by Japanese competition. We all know that this knock-out power of Japanese competition is ascribed to Japanese “sweated” labour. “If”, my relative said to me “I got my raw materials for nothing and my labour for nothing I still could not compete with the Japanese.” No chatter about sweated labour can explain this:—Japan bought raw cotton from India at so much a bale, transported it some thousands of miles, made it into manufactured articles and carried these back to India, selling them over the barrier of an 80 per cent import duty *at less than the cost of the raw*

materials. How was this done? The Japanese Government reimbursed the manufacturers for the difference between the selling price of the goods and a price allowing for a fair profit. Where did the money come from? Where it all comes from, except for the almost negligible proportion existing as currency, from the people who, as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* puts it, "create the means of payment out of nothing", i.e. the banking system. The difference from the normal routine was that these "loans" were non-interest bearing. How did the Japanese get the idea for this? From a lopsided, very partial and distorted application of the technique set out in the writings of the great Scottish monetary reformer the late Major C. H. Douglas, the sale of whose books on his teachings (Social Credit) in Japan exceeded that for the whole of the rest of the world put together. Japan's financial heterodoxy was, of course, the real reason why "America" (Wall Street and Pine Street) forced war upon her for what would become of the likes of them should such heterodoxy spread? The intense irony of the situation is that the work of the man who, with Professor Soddy, has done more than anyone to expose the sham and fraud of "sound finance" should be deliberately stifled or caricatured and libelled in his own country, and acclaimed and acted on, though in a very incomplete and distorted way, the other side of the earth.

As a youth and young man, the writer confesses (with no little shame nowadays to think his heart was so much stronger than his head), he was seduced by the sedulous and, it must be admitted, superficially convincing propaganda of various Swaraj bodies in this country—propaganda supported by the rather shocking behaviour of some inferior types of Englishmen in that country. As time went on, however, and he began to discover the way the unfortunate *Harijans* were treated in their own country by their own people, and to acquire knowledge of the workings of the Money-Power and what Father Fahey calls "the Internationalists" his suspicions of these "Home Rule For India" bodies began to be actively aroused, more particularly when he saw on the platform of a public meeting of one of the biggest of them the wife of a gentleman closely connected with a body called Political and Economic Planning and with those same "Internationalists" referred to by Father Fahey. By this time he knew quite enough to know that whatever *they* might be concerned with it was most decidedly not freedom for anybody or anything but the interests for which *they* stood, and the very fact of their association with any "Swaraj" body was by that time sufficient to damn it in his eyes.

INCREASING CORRUPTION

Later came a sojourn in India on family matters of a year and a half, when he was able to hear what many of the ablest and most far-seeing of his own people on the paternal side thought and felt about Congress, Swaraj and all the rest of the bag of tricks. From them he learned that every single advance in—as it used to be called—"Indianisation" of the administration of the Government of India had been accompanied by an enormous increase in costs of Government *pari passu* with an ever increasing negligence and inefficiency. Judging by what he now hears from his relatives, this process has been proceeding in geometrical progression ever since the end of the Raj. "Oh! If we only had the British back again", they say over and over again. Such is presumably the spectacle presented to him by the administrative incompetence and corruption of his own people that the Indian author of *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, which made some stir here a few years since, tacitly admits the same sentiment. The monomania of nationalism, different *toto coelo* from a wholesome and proper patriotism, leads peoples to attribute to themselves all sorts of abilities and qualities that they do not possess.

Gandhi's artful appeal to self-interest under a guise of

amour-propre: "good government is no substitute for self-government" really means that the good government India got under the British prevented the copious flow of graft that would be available under "self"-government, with hordes of relations of officials smuggled in to share in the pelf of governmental posts and jobs. No loss either of "national" or personal dignity is involved in a frank admission of limitations, nor in a turning over of work for which one is temperamentally or psychologically unfitted to others more qualified. India, bitten by the bug of a morbid and hypertrophied "nationalism" that it has well suited certain unscrupulous interests at home and abroad to encourage is finding this out progressively when it is perhaps too late for anything to be done about it, beyond the fantastically remote contingency of a frank and honest admission of failure and a *cri de coeur*, "For God's sake come back, take charge and help us clean up the mess", which the Indian author already mentioned did indirectly half hint at.

KAIKHOSRU SHAPURJI SORABJI.

Originally published in **Candour**,
29th July-5th August, 1955

*

THE EPITOME OF LIBERALISM

Still, eccentricity is not confined to racists. A friend of mine was mugged last week in Hackney by a young black man. She was physically assaulted, but the challenge to her liberal principles was even more traumatic, and in a fit of anti-racist zeal, the description of the man she gave to the police was accurate in every detail except that she said he was white instead of black. My initial thought was that the real ethical problem would come when the police arrested and extracted a confession from a white man answering her description. But apparently the police told her that they had no white people on file, and so there was no chance of catching anybody. It seems like a subject almost worthy of an allegorical painting: blind justice caught between the Scylla of liberal insanity and the Charybdis of institutional racism.

My friend was dragged along a crowded street as the man struggled to free her bag from her shoulder, and nobody made any attempt to aid her. It may have been that the bystanders were cowards pretending that nothing was happening. On the other hand, they may all have been liberals like herself who were viewing the episode with a troubled complicated sense that maybe the young man had a point, albeit expressed with an arguably regrettable lack of tact.

The New Statesman, 1st October 1993

THE CONSPIRACY BEHIND N.A.F.T.A.

The North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement [N.A.F.T.A.] is being denounced unanimously by American patriots as posing an alarming threat to every wage earner because it allows big business to move industries en masse to Mexico in order to take advantage of starvation wage rates. On a higher level of political consciousness, it is rightly being identified as a parallel economic mechanism to the European Union and Pacific Rim agreements, which all share the eventual goal of establishing an integrated one-world economic order. The article below is extracted from the latest issue of **Don Bell Reports** [P.O. Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, U.S.A.] and places N.A.F.T.A. in the longer term context of the power-drive towards a global economic order.

*

It has been said that President Bush was the originator of the NAFTA plan. Not true. President Kennedy initiated the scheme when he introduced to Congress the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Some background material seems necessary. Shortly after the end of WWII and the creation of the United Nations, the idea of World Government was being seriously proposed as a means of preventing another world conflict and of insuring perpetual peace. Promoting the idea were many influential and well-financed organizations such as the United World Federalists, Union Now, Campaign for World Government, World Republic, Students for World Government, Atlantic Union Committee, World Citizenship Movement, Committee to Frame the World Constitution, etc. So extensive was this Crusade for World Government that President Harry Truman wrote on White House stationery a letter to Cord Meyer of UWF: "I am happy to extend greetings to the members of United World Federalists, Inc....From time to time, the increasing activities of your organization have come to my attention, and I must congratulate you on the patriotism and high sense of historical destiny that inspires your work....Very sincerely yours, Harry S. Truman." It may have been Divine intervention, but conservative Americans were awakened and able to halt at that time, the Crusade for World Government in the late 1940s.

Then the One Worlders sensed that any such direct crusade would not succeed. Another plan was adopted and the Interdependence of Nations was chosen as the better approach. So, in his Independence Day speech on July 4, 1962, President Kennedy said among other things: "We must move on from the ideal of national independence to interdependence upon other nations." Dan Smoot, author of The Invisible Government which exposed the activities of the Council on Foreign Relations, was one of the first to sense and publicly denounce the Interdependence scheme. In his newsletter, Dan Smoot Reports, of 8/6/62, he explained the new One Worlder scheme: "The drive toward integrating the United States into an international socialist system is being pushed on three broad fronts: political, military, and economic....In the economic field, the technique is to make America dependent on foreign sources of supply for critical materials and to make us so subject to foreign political-economic decisions that we will be forced to surrender control over our trade and commerce to an international authority which can regulate the trade of the world. The economic part of this three-pronged scheme is wrapped up in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, because it is the most difficult to combat. President Kennedy has repeatedly called the Trade

Expansion Act 'the most important piece of legislation before the country this year'." It was, and it was passed that year.

Smoot explained: "Although the Constitution gives Congress the power 'to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States,' the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 gives the President almost limitless authority to abolish or raise tariffs ... authorizes the President to subsidize business firms ... and to provide unemployment compensation for workers thus thrown out of jobs ... grants retroactive power to give subsidies to workers and businessmen who have been hurt by any tariff reductions made since 1934; and it sets no limit on amount ... In other words, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 could establish, immediately, a communist-fascist type of governmental control over major American industries and millions of workers and could, within a few years, lead to the total communist-fascist state in the United States."

The Kennedy Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the Bush-Clinton North American Free Trade Agreement are the same in purpose and goal. But they differ in detail and programming because of the adoption of new tactics by the International Planners after the creation of the Trilateral Commission in 1973. Under the Kennedy Plan there would be an international authority (GATT) which would regulate the trade of the world. GATT still exists and struggles to get all the nations to agree with its terms. So the Trilateral Commissioners and their New World Order elitists decided that it would be easier if instead of having only a central authority in a one world government, the world should be divided into three economic spheres; EUROPE, NAFTA, and EASTASIA. So with GATT acting as the Trade and Economic Cabinet in the Executive branch of One World Government, NAFTA would be a Regional branch of World Government. It is estimated that NAFTA would have some 200 costly three-nation councils, commissions, secretariats, tribunals, review boards, evaluation committees, dispute settlement panels, working groups, and administrative officers. "How many bureaucrats will staff these agencies, and who will pay them?" asks John Stormer, author of None Dare Call It Treason...25 years later, and editor of the newsletter Understanding the Times (Liberty Bell Press, POBox 32, Florissant, MO 63023. \$29.95 for ten reports issued periodically).

The Kennedy Trade Expansion Act was never fully expanded, probably for two reasons: the assassination of its promoter, and his successor LBJ being too busy promoting his Great Society legislation and keeping an eye on the progress of the war in Vietnam and the social turmoil it occasioned domestically because of its unpopularity. But with the new programming of the One Worlders, NAFTA will become something of an addition to the still existing Kennedy Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Henry Kissinger said it best when, promoting NAFTA and suggesting that Clinton become more active in its promotion, explained: "NAFTA is not a conventional trade agreement but the architect of a new international system...the most creative step toward a new world order taken by any group of countries since the end of the Cold War."

To call NAFTA a free trade agreement is perpetrating a massive fraud on the millions of Americans and most of the Congressmen who support free trade but have never learned NAFTA provides managed trade, since few of them have read the 2000 pages of the agreement.

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE STONE

ON November 18 a memorial stone standing in a farmer's field a few miles south of Glasgow was attacked and smashed by a gang of political vandals accompanied, by prior arrangement, by a film crew from Scottish television along with assorted journalists. The stone was in a secluded position on private land and bore the words "This stone marks the spot where brave, heroic Rudolf Hess landed by parachute on the night of 10th May 1941 seeking to end the war between Britain and Germany."

The destruction of the memorial to Hess' peace mission was the work of the so-called "Anti-Nazi League". The leader of the gang is an Aaman Anwar, described as the West of Scotland organiser. If you are on the side of freedom of expression and protection of private property, then please write to the local police [Officer-in-Charge, Police Office, 4 Braidholm Road, Giffnock, Glasgow G46] and call for the prosecution of Anwar and his fellow culprits for malicious damage. Remember - the action that is not taken will influence no-one!

SORTING OUT MEN FROM BOYS

PLYMOUTH City Council's attempt to ban the reputedly sexist label man-ager may be linked to the disappearance of Latin and Greek from our schools. Contrary to the belief of the Plymouth socialist brethren, the letters man- in the word manager come from the Latin manus for hand. Manipulative, perhaps, but not sexist! We wonder what nomenclature the council leaders would prefer for their manuscripts or for the manometers in their schools? Will they maintain the manors and man-sions in their care? Will they produce a manifesto to ban the sale of manzanilla, mangoes or mandarine oranges in the city shops? We also wonder if similarly left-lurching Manchester City Council will not follow suit with arguments to manipulate language as there are so many other examples where man or men has no male connotation whatsoever except in the strange minds of those who contrive to place it.

Read **MAMMON VERSUS GOD**. Sub-titled "The Bankers' New World Disorder", this new booklet by Dr Kitty Little frankly exposes the forces behind usury, the undermining of Christianity and the fuss about "war crimes". Only £1.25 from Inter-City Research Press, 31 Eastvale, Second Avenue, Acton Vale, London W3 7RU.

We apologise for the pastiche appearance of this issue of Candour. Our Editor's recent hip affliction has spread to the word processor, which has also gone on the 'blink'! Normal standards of presentation will be resumed as soon as possible. In the meantime, we wish all our loyal readers a Happy and Holy Christmas and a Right New Year.

CANDOUR needs more readers. Have you secured another subscriber yet?
Also, have you asked your local library to order **CANDOUR**?

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £12 OVERSEAS £15 U.S. \$25 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD. [Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle]